

To: Jenkins, Laura Flynn[Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov]; Peterson, Cynthia[Peterson.Cynthia@epa.gov]
Cc: StClair, Christie[StClair.Christie@epa.gov]; Grantham, Nancy[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]; Thomas, Rebecca[Thomas.Rebecca@epa.gov]; R8 GKM Leadership Team[R8_GKM_LeadershipTeam@epa.gov]
From: Dhieux, Joyel
Sent: Mon 5/23/2016 9:06:43 PM
Subject: RE: Question on treatment plant

Hi Laura and Cynthia,

I thought we had already come up with a response to this request, but I sure couldn't find it in all of our communication plans. My two cents:

The interim water treatment plant installed at Gladstone in November 2015 was designed to treat the ongoing acid mine drainage from the Gold King Mine as EPA continues work activities at the mine through 2016. The treatment plant was specifically designed to handle both the flow and the composition of the discharge from Gold King Mine. The water treatment plant was not designed to handle additional flows from other mines in the area.

Joyel

.....

Joyel R. Dhieux

Federal On-Scene Coordinator

U.S. EPA Region 8

Ph: 303-312-6647

Cell: 720-441-9961

From: Jenkins, Laura Flynn
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 2:05 PM
To: Peterson, Cynthia <Peterson.Cynthia@epa.gov>
Cc: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Thomas, Rebecca <Thomas.Rebecca@epa.gov>; R8 GKM

Leadership Team <R8_GKM_LeadershipTeam@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Question on treatment plant

+ David/Joyel/Kerry/Suzanne

Can one you please respond to the additional question below? I'll consolidate into a single response.

Laura Jenkins

Media Officer

USEPA-Region 8

1595 Wynkoop St.

Mailcode: 8-OC

Denver, CO 80202

Landline: 303-312-6256

Cell: 202-360-8453

Fax: 303-312-6961

From: Peterson, Cynthia

Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 1:57 PM

To: Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>

Cc: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Thomas, Rebecca <Thomas.Rebecca@epa.gov>

Subject: Fwd: Question on treatment plant

Follow-up question. Rebecca thinks that we can't add more than we are looking at options and a decision will be made soon. Probably your earlier answer will suffice.

Sent from my EPA iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <editor@silvertonstandard.com>
Date: May 23, 2016 at 12:34:04 PM MDT
To: "Peterson, Cynthia" <Peterson.Cynthia@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Question on treatment plant

Thanks.

And one more question.

The EPA has spoken of possible interim remediation actions that can be taken this summer, in addition to the investigative work.

Given how easy (operationally) it would likely be to treat the American Tunnel discharge, would that be under consideration for this summer?

On Mon, May 23, 2016 12:10 pm, Peterson, Cynthia wrote:

Hi, Mark.

Let me get some information on this, and I'll get back to you ASAP.

Cynthia

Sent from my EPA iPhone

On May 23, 2016, at 11:07 AM, Silverton Standard

<silvertonstandard@animas.net> wrote:

Hi Cynthia;

I was up Cement Creek today and I can't help noticing the American Tunnel, yards away from the expensive plant, discharging directly into Cement Creek, untreated.

I was wondering if the EPA can really explain that.

The pipe from the Gold King actually runs right over the American Tunnel discharge ditch.

If the EPA can do removal action at the Red & Bonita and Gold King, why not treat the American Tunnel runoff which is only yards from the plant?

It seems to me that any objective effort actually aimed at water quality improvement would address that obvious source.

And to let that water go untreated yards away from a new, expensive plant does not seem very reasonable.

Was any effort made at all to have Kinross agree to treat the American
Tunnel discharge?